

REMARKS

Rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2006/0227780 (Inouchi)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-20.

MPEP § 2131 provides: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant respectfully submits that Inouchi does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in independent claims 1 and 11. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 11 require "transmitting to a remote gateway via a tunnel of a virtual private network (VPN) a DNS setup packet comprising a global name of a home network... receiving from said remote gateway via said tunnel a DNS setup reply packet comprising a global name of another home network...and configuring an application level gateway of said DNS server (DNS-ALG) in said home network dependent upon said DNS setup reply packet" which is not anticipated either expressly or inherently, in Inouchi.

Inouchi is directed to a translator that includes a unit for communication with a DNS-ALG. The translator translates IPv4 address packets to IPv6 address packets and vice versa (Inouchi's abstract). It is clear from Inouchi's figures 4 and 5 that each IPv4 or IPv6 address packets contain a source address, a destination address and other related information. In IPv4 or IPv6 address packets, the source address identifies the IP address of the source or of the home network. Inouchi also discloses a terminal 4a which makes a DNS query to obtain the name and address of terminal 4c. The terminal 4c then sends a DNS response packet to terminal 4a.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement in item 2, page 3, of the Office Action dated 03/08/2007 that Inouchi discloses "a DNS setup packet comprising the global name of the home network...(It is inherent that IPv4 and IPv6 comprising the global name of a home network and a private address of a DNS server, refer to 0054, 0058, 0059)." The cited passage, in contrast, discloses IPv4 and IPv6 address packets and their translation from one to another. IPv4 and IPv6 address packets do not identify the global name of the source or of the home network. Applicant's claims 1 and 11 require "a DNS setup packet comprising a global name of a home network". Thus, Applicant's claim limitation of "a DNS setup packet comprising a global name of the home network" is missing from Inouchi.

It is clear that the Office Action equates Applicant's "DNS setup packet" to Inouchi's IPv4 or IPv6 address packets, but as argued above such an equation is improper. At best, Applicant's "DNS setup packet" may be equated to Inouchi's DNS query packet. However, even such a comparison is improper because Applicant's "DNS setup packet" is not the same as Inouchi's DNS query packet. Applicant's claims 1 and 11 require "a DNS setup packet comprising a global name of a home network and a private address of a DNS server," whereas Inouchi's DNS query packet contains the destination name, the type of query and the class of query (Fig. 6, Inouchi). Inouchi's DNS query packet does not contain a global address or a private address of a home network. Thus, Applicant's claim limitation of "a DNS setup packet comprising a global name of the home network, and a private address of a DNS server" is missing from Inouchi.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement in item 2, page 3, of the Office Action dated 03/08/2007 that Inouchi discloses "a DNS setup reply packet comprising the global name of another home network...(It is inherent that IPv4 and IPv6 comprising the global name of a home network and a private address of a DNS server, refer to 0061, 0062)." The cited passage, in contrast, discloses IPv4 and IPv6 address packets and their translation from one to another. IPv4 and IPv6 address packets do not identify the global name of the source or of the home network. Applicant's claims 1 and 11 require "a DNS setup reply packet comprises a global name of another home network." Thus, Applicant's claim limitation of "a DNS setup reply packet comprising a global name of the other home network" is missing from Inouchi.

It is clear that the Office Action equates Applicant's "DNS setup reply packet" to Inouchi's IPv4 or IPv6 address packets, but as argued above such an equation is improper. At

best, Applicant's "DNS setup reply packet" may be equated to Inouchi's DNS response packet. However, even such a comparison is also improper because Applicant's "DNS setup reply packet" is not the same as Inouchi's DNS response packet. Applicant's claims 1 and 11 require "a DNS setup reply packet comprising a global name of another home network, and a private address of a DNS server," whereas Inouchi's DNS response packet contains name, type, class and other related information about a terminal (Fig. 7, Inouchi). Inouchi's DNS response packet does not contain a global address or a private address of another home network server. Thus, Applicant's claim limitation of "a DNS setup reply packet comprising a global name of the other home network, and a private address of a DNS server" is missing from Inouchi.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement in item 2, page 3, of the Office Action dated 03/08/2007 that Inouchi describes "a DNS-ALG in the home network dependent upon the DNS setup reply packet". As mentioned above, Inouchi does not disclose "a DNS setup reply packet." Hence, Inouchi does not disclose DNS-ALG being dependent upon a DNS setup reply packet. Thus, Applicant's claim limitation of "a DNS-ALG in the home network dependent upon the DNS setup reply packet" is missing from Inouchi.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement in item 2, page 3, of the Office Action dated 03/08/2007 that Inouchi describes limitations of claim 8. Applicant requests the examiner to cite a paragraph from Inouchi that reads upon Applicant's claim 8, as the Applicant fails to find any such limitation in Inouchi. Therefore the Applicant believes that the office action is improper and a final office action cannot be issued until such specificity is provided. In the absence of such specificity, Applicant submits that claim 8 is not anticipated by Inouchi, and therefore the rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claim 8 may now be passed to allowance.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Inouchi does not disclose a "DNS setup packet", "a DNS setup reply packet" and "a DNS-ALG dependent upon the DNS setup reply packet". Applicant, therefore, submits that claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by Inouchi, and therefore the rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 USC 102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claims 1 and 11 may now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-10 and 12-20 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1, 8 and 11, which are shown to be allowable for the reasons given above.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-7, 9-10 and 12-20 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 2-7, 9-10 and 12-20 may now be passed to allowance.

Information Disclosure Statement

The action office action indicates that the information disclosure statement filed does not comply with the rules because **"it comprising web link, an actual hardcopy of the prior art is required"**. It is submitted that **an actual copy was supplied**, not a web link. This was verified as the NPL reference that is available in this application in Private PAIR is not a link but in fact the submitted prior art. Because the submission is the prior art copy and not merely a web link it is believed to be a proper submission and as such should be considered in this application.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

By: /Daniel K. Nichols/

Daniel K. Nichols
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 29,420

Telephone: 847-576-5219
Fax No.: 847-576-3750